Case 1:12-cr-00615-JPO Document 36 Filed 03/06/14 Page 1 of 33 1

DBF StamS Sentence	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
V.	S1 12 Cr. 615 (JPO)
AMIR ABBAS TAMIMI,	
Defendant.	
x	
	November 15, 2013 10:15 a.m.
Before:	
HON. J. PAUL	OETKEN,
	District Judge
APPEARAN(CES
PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York BY: JASON P.W. HALPERIN ANDREA SURRATT Assistant United States Attorn	
THE LAW OFFICES OF SAEID B. AMINI Attorneys for Defendant BY: SAEID BARADARAN AMINI	

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Case called)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Your Honor, this is in the matter of United States of America versus Amir Tamimi.

Starting with the government, can I have counsel state their appearance for the record, please?

MR. HALPERIN: Good morning, your Honor. Halperin and Andrea Surratt for the government. With us at counsel table is Special Agent David Balint of the FBI, Thomas Smith of the Department of Commerce, and Matthew Fede of the Department of Homeland Security.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. AMINI: Good morning. Saeid Amini for defendant Amir Tamimi.

THE COURT: Good morning.

Please swear in the interpreter.

(Interpreter sworn)

THE COURT: We are here today for the imposition of sentencing in this case. Mr. Tamimi pleaded guilty on July 10th of this year to one count of conspiring to violate IEPA, the International Economic Emergency Powers Act, which is a class C felony under federal law. This is a second sentencing hearing. We had scheduled sentencing for a couple of weeks ago and since that time there have been additional submissions.

Are there any preliminary matters before we proceed with sentencing?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HALPERIN: Not from the government, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Amini?

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, I apologize.

The defendant was thinking about withdrawing the plea and wanted to see if time would be granted before sentencing so we can file a motion. I talked to him this morning. He said my heart is hurting, I want to get over it. So, based on our discussion yesterday I was going to request the Court to give us extra time before sentencing for the motion but this morning he said my heart is hurting, please go ahead, and I'll just put myself in the Court's decisions.

THE COURT: When he said his heart is hurting, do you mean, was it -- is that a physical issue or?

> MR. AMINI: I believe so. He had a heart attack --(Defendant and counsel conferring)

MR. AMINI: He had a heart attack -- this is in the filing of the PSR also. He had a heart attack before and he collapsed one time and he was in prison with the other, with the previous attorney. He does have medical problems, yes, and this is in the PSR report and he said my heart is hurting.

THE COURT: What does the heart hurting have to do with whether we go forward with sentencing or he moves to withdraw his plea?

He believes he cannot just go through the MR. AMINI: trial and not knowing what is going to happen, that's what he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

explained to me. But I permanently advised him and I am involved with the case, this is a good case of entrapment, entrapment defense, and I was willing to take it to trial. There was a discussion with the previous attorney on the plea and how a plea is good for cases like this. And I mentioned to him, he said he would rather go with plea despite my advice. Since the last time we were in the Court I spoke with him on the phone a couple times. He agreed for me to request the Court for an extension of the sentence and so I can file the motion. The Court may deny it. I know about Rule 11, I have done it in the past, I know there is a long jump, we have to go to convince the Court, it is not easy, but I wanted to mention to my client that is one other option. And he kind of agreed to it yesterday but today he is just saying he doesn't believe he can take the beating, basically, for the trial and going to trial.

I don't know what to do, your Honor. That's what my problem is.

THE COURT: Mr. Halperin?

MR. HALPERIN: If I may make a suggestion?

Number one, the government would strongly oppose such a motion, obviously, and thinks it is entirely baseless. Second Circuit case law is extremely strong about what an incredibly high standard it is for the defendant to be able to withdraw his plea. Those factors are clearly not existent in

this case.

I think clearly what has happened is that as these sentencing hearings and presentencing hearings have progressed and as these submissions have been filed with the Court, the defendant has realized that he may well be getting a sentence much, much higher than the time-served of a year and a day that he has asked the Court for. We have had a chance just to do some very preliminary research but there is a Second Circuit case, I think called Gonzalez, which says just because the defendant has a change of heart about what he might receive at sentencing that is of course no basis to withdraw a plea.

What the government would ask, your Honor, is that we go forward with the sentencing today. We really think there is no reason for further delay of the sentencing. And then, one possibility would be we would have no objection if the Court wanted to hold off on filing the actual judgment and giving the defendant a period of two or three weeks so he can take this time and think about this and if he wants to file a motion to withdraw his plea, at that point we will vigorously oppose it and then the Court will rule. And if the Court denies it then the Court can go ahead and enter the judgment.

But, we see no reason to further delay today's sentencing. It sounds like the defendant may not want to make the motion based on what his attorney is saying but that's our position, your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Is it possible to move to withdraw after I have sentenced him here but before I have issued the actual judament?

MS. SURRATT: Your Honor, we haven't had a chance to do extensive research on this. Rule 11.5(e) says that after a Court imposes sentence the defendant may not withdraw a plea of quilty or nolo contendre and the plea may be set aside only on direct appeal or collateral attack. The rule itself is not clear as to whether that means the oral imposition of sentence or the entry of judgment.

THE COURT: Right.

Well, let me just say I'm familiar with the Gonzalez case of the Second Circuit which is 970 F.2d 1095, and it sets forth the standard for withdrawal of a guilty plea under Rule 11; A defendant is permitted to withdraw his guilty plea but only before sentencing if he can show a fair and just reason for requesting the withdrawal. And the factors that the Court considers as to whether there is a fair and just reason to justify withdrawal of a plea are or they include, one, the amount of time that has elapsed between the plea and the motion -- here it has been several months since July, four months -- second, whether the defendant has asserted a claim of legal innocence; and third, whether the government would be prejudiced by a withdrawal of the plea. And insofar as the motion to withdraw is based on involuntariness, the defendant

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

must raise a significant question about the voluntariness of the original plea. A defendant's bald statements that simply contradict what he said in his plea allocution are not sufficient grounds to withdraw the quilty plea.

I mean, without revealing attorney-client communications, what would be the ground for withdrawal of the plea?

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, it seems like the government is enlarging the scope of the plea. The plea which was offered to my client, the parts therefore were helicopter owned by Red Cross and they enlarged the scope of it and they also actually falsified to FBI and to the Court and this is outside of the plea which we believe they did not stick to their side of the bargain, they extended, the enlarged the scope of the plea in that case.

THE COURT: But the elements of the offense are what they are; voluntarily entering into an agreement that violates the statute. And I know there is disputes about the 60-page helicopter part request and the 21 particular items that you say were actually sent by the defendant. Whichever version you accept the guideline calculation is the same, it is 46 to 57 months. So, I don't know what turns on that.

MR. AMINI: But, your Honor, in the last hearing when Mr. Tamimi said his order was for wires and screws and things like that, the government actually stood up and said he is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

lying and he is falsifying to the Court. After they submitted their own submission they actually attached a table which actually verified what Mr. Tamimi said. And then they had nothing to do with the order just looking to make sure the parts are the same so they're enlarging the scope.

And, your Honor, for the sentencing we believe, based on all these cases, the Justice Department has published, it makes no difference to the Courts if the item really, what kind of item they are, if they are for nuclear purposes or if they are for very important items or in this case we have the wires and screws. It may not make much difference on the violation -- a violation is a violation -- but if the posted speed sign is 60, I'm going 65, I violate it, but if somebody is going 100 it is also violated. But the sentence and the punishment for somebody's caught driving 100 miles is different from somebody's driving 65 miles.

In this case our argument is this is a 62 mile case in a 60 mile zone, not 100 mile, as the government is trying to make -- the government is asking for 57 months, your Honor. That kind of sentence hasn't been given for people that have \$50 million transactions already made.

In this case Mr. Tamimi, all he has done is just given the list. We even don't know if those parts actually exist. The individual number one, which the government tells me to refer to the person, I have mentioned in my brief, the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

individual no. 1, even we don't know he had the part. If the part does not exist and my client sends just the request, I don't know if the violation really has happened, your Honor. It maybe is my fault, I don't have enough knowledge of it, but if I don't have the part how do you make a request from me? THE COURT: Here is the thing.

You talk about 100 miles an hour, 60 miles an hour. The agreement was going above the speed limit. The agreement was as to the elements of the crime. The agreement was -- the disputes that are going on now in the sentencing submissions are all about the attendant circumstances of the crime but they don't change that he pled guilty to the elements of the crime.

Do you understand? Do you agree?

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, he pled for the attempt of those items --

It wasn't attempt, it was conspiracy. THE COURT: was conspiracy which is different legally.

MR. AMINI: But conspiracy in this case, if the -- the co-conspirator, in this case if he does not have the part, is telling me to give a list, I have provided the part. co-conspirator actually does not have the part I don't know there is a violation. He pled for it because he wanted to get the case over with. But if this case goes to trial, my argument is if the co-conspirator comes to the trial and testifies I did not even have these files, I was making it up

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with the FBI to make a file for you, I'm not sure there actually is a violation because he did not have the part to give.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Halperin, do you want to address that?

MR. HALPERIN: Yes, your Honor.

I think this whole question makes entirely clear how baseless such a motion would be and now that we have heard what the supposed grounds would be for withdrawing a plea, I want to amend my previous statement. We would oppose even the defendant being allowed to file a motion to withdraw the plea. We think there is actually no grounds.

As the Court just noted, in no way, shape or form has the government sought to enlarge the scope of the plea. I'm not even sure what that means.

The Court noted that there was specific elements to the offense to which Mr. Tamimi agreed and pled guilty and acknowledged that he had done those things. The plea agreement set forth a very clear guideline range of 46 to 57 months. allowed a carve-out for defense counsel to argue for that lower offense level. This Court has already ruled that level 26 should apply and that the guideline range is 46 to 57 months. He has already agreed to waive an appeal of any sentence 57 months or less. Based on all the reasons we have set forth in our supplemental submission, we are obviously asking for a top

of the guidelines range and as we said earlier, the only thing that has changed is that the defendant may have thought a month ago in mid-October that he might have gotten a sentence of time-served. Obviously the government has no idea what the Court will determine to be the appropriate sentence today but based on everything we have submitted, we certainly think there is a very strong argument for a much, much higher sentence than that and that is what is clearly driving this.

So, we would strongly oppose the defendant being allowed to even file a motion to withdraw his plea.

THE COURT: Well, I think I need to determine whether the defendant wishes to file a motion to withdraw his plea. I will say, given the standard, the defendant should know that I haven't heard anything in what you have offered that suggests what would count as a fair and just reason for requesting the withdrawal but a defendant does have a right to seek it. So, I would certainly consider putting off the sentence to give you a chance to withdraw it but I should also warn the defendant that if he files a motion to withdraw the plea that there could be an effect on the guidelines calculation because of the acceptance of responsibility points. And if I decided to deny the points for acceptance of responsibility the guideline calculation would be higher. The low end of the range wouldn't be 46 months, I think it would be higher.

Well, let me ask, first, does the defendant challenge

the voluntariness of the plea? Was there something involuntary about the plea?

(Defendant and counsel conferring)

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, he told me his plea was voluntary for what he said. Anything more than that it was not his plea. But for the items listed on the 21 list, just provided in the list and that was for Red Cross and that was his plea.

(defendant and counsel conferring)

MR. AMINI: And he would like to finish it today and he wants to put himself at the mercy of the Court and get it over with. That's what he also said.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I mean, I will tell you the guidelines calculation is what it is. I believe that he not only did he have the plea agreement which clearly set forth the government's view of the guideline calculation which I think is the correct guidelines calculation and which is the starting point for sentencing, as I said, I also went through at the plea allocution several times and said were there any other agreements you had other than this plea agreement? He said no. I asked him do you understand that I'm the one who will decide on your sentence? He understood. And several other questions in the plea allocution to make sure it is voluntary. So, I believe it would be difficult to show that it was not voluntary. In my view what he admitted to counted as

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

satisfying the elements of the conspiracy offense even though the transaction didn't go through and there were no parts sent, etc. I don't think that is required to meet the elements of the crime.

Now, if you need a few minutes to talk with your client I will give you five minutes if you would like or whatever you want, to talk with your client about whether you would like to make an actual motion to withdraw the plea. Would you like a few minutes?

MR. AMINI: Yes, your Honor. That way I cover myself.

MR. HALPERIN: Your Honor, if I can quickly put something on the record?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. HALPERIN: Because the Court brought up an issue that frankly I had not thought of, but if the Court denies a possible motion to withdraw the plea and then finds that the defendant should not get three points of acceptance of responsibility, the government wants to put on the record that the offense level would then be 26 with a guideline range of 63 to 78 months, so considerably higher than the 46 to 57 months that it currently is. So, I think the defendant may want to know that while he is talking to his attorney.

THE COURT: Did you understand that?

Yes. He knows about the guideline too, MR. AMINI: your Honor, but the defendant also has a chance to prevail at

entrapment defense in this case and we hope individual no. 1 comes and testifies, the FBI agent. They have been on his tail for 10 months. I believe for him to get convicted at that range he has to get convicted before the jury. But if your Honor would give me five minutes I will talk to him. But before that, your Honor, it has not been fair for my client because he has no one here for him to testify at his trial. He has not his father, not his wife. He doesn't have individual no. 1 to come and testify what happened between them.

In the sentencing here for downward departure actually it is important for the family members to come and see and, as the PSR has said, there is downward departure warranted in this case.

MR. HALPERIN: Your Honor, I want to respond because I think this Court has been incredibly fair in terms of the process and procedures it has allowed the defendant so I just feel like it is important to respond on the record. To claim that somehow it has not been fair, the Court very clearly and carefully allocuted Mr. Tamimi at his plea hearing that he would be giving up valuable constitutional rights by pleading guilty instead of exercising his constitutional right to go to trial including the right to call witnesses on his own behalf, the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses, the right to subpoena witnesses. All of those things this Court allocuted

him on extremely clearly.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, the government strongly objects to any notion that these proceedings have not been fair. They have been entirely fair. This Court has been very generous in terms of allowing Mr. Tamimi to file any submissions he wanted before sentencing and we just wanted to make that point clearly on the record, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, I may have misspoken. I did not say this specific Court had done anything wrong. No, that's not true, actually. I did not mention that. This Court has been really generous, has been really nice, and I'm not saying that to get leniency for my client, I am being honest on that. What I said was in the sentencing usually family members come and they testify. That's not at trial, for the sentencing is a different phase. We don't have an opportunity as really is not the fault of the Court, it is our fault being 6,000 miles away and they don't have a visa. I cannot bring the sick wife and the sick father to come and testify and plead to the Court. This Court doesn't have that picture in the mind how the wife and how the father feels when the person who is provided to them is in the prison in the United States. is what I meant to say. It is just circumstances we are in and he is alone and he only has me in Washington, D.C.

That is all I was trying to say, nothing to do with

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 the Court. The Court has been more than generous with us, your 2 Honor.

THE COURT: I understand. Thank you.

MR. AMINI: And the defendant knows that.

THE COURT: Okay. Why don't we take a few minutes and discuss and I will come back and -- you would like to take a few minutes?

MR. AMINI: I would appreciate it if you can give me five minutes, if you can.

(Recess)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Swear the second interpreter, please?

THE COURT: Yes.

(interpreter sworn)

THE COURT: Mr. Amini, did you get a chance to discuss?

MR. AMINI: Yes, your Honor. Mr. Tamimi himself wants to address the Court on the issue and that will probably be the best if you will allow it, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes. He may.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I thank you for the opportunity that you gave me. I have asked my attorney, considering all the trouble I have created for the Court and --

INTERPRETER: I'm sorry.

I have asked my attorney to consider the expenses that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have incurred for the United States government and the Court I have asked him not to file a motion and that my sentencing to be completed today. And I sincerely want to express my regret. I really regret, considering the expenses I have incurred for the United States government, I apologize to the United States Attorney who is present here and also the Honorable Court, especially your Honor and considering my own health factors that I had a heart attack, I was in coma for 10 days and also my family members are ill; my wife, my father, please and I have an 11-year-old daughter who has been waiting me for 14 months now. I ask you, please, pay attention to the -- consider the PSR report so that I can go back to my family and I thank you for the opportunity you have given me.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Is there anything further, Mr. Amini?

MR. AMINI: Yes, your Honor.

In the information provided in the PSR it has the family background and all the information in it are correct and there is a recommendation which defendant would like the Court to adopt, if it is possible, and based on the other cases of similar kind we have provided to the Court, we believe the recommendation of the PSR is warranted. We just hope by sending Mr. Tamimi back home the whole society will benefit from it and the government won't spend too much time keeping him in prison in the United States while his family, borrowing

money and living in Iran.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Just one thing, your Honor. When he came to the United States he had \$4,000 with him and he actually sold his car -- and this is honestly a true story, I talked to his wife -- he sold his car in order to get the money to come to the United States. He told this to the FBI agent, his wife independently confirmed that to me. He was unemployed for one year before coming to the United States and it just is at the mercy of the Court and just we hope Court follows all the cases they are convicted up, IEPA for many other charges for many people including Dr. Amin Nazmi, he got only 40 months. convicted by the jury for an IEEPA violation, conspiracy and actually tax evasion, a list of items, eight or nine. He was convicted and the Court gave him 40 months. And there are lots of other cases we listed and the government also listed and we just hope the recommendation of the PSR and the probation office can be adopted by the Court, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. AMINI: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So, I think we will proceed to sentencing in this case. I really essentially began the sentencing process last time and went through the guideline calculation, we will briefly review what I went over last time in anticipation of sentencing.

I will start by, just for the record, noting the 1 materials I have reviewed for today: The presentence report 2 3 and addendum and sentencing recommendation by probation, the initial submission by defense counsel which was on September 4 5 29th, submission by the government dated October 18th, then the 6 defendant's submission dated October 23rd, the government's 7 sur-reply dated October 24th, government submission with attachments dated November 7th, defendant's submission with 8 9 attachments dated November 12th, and then the government's 10 letter dated November 14th. 11 Mr. Amini, you have read the presentence report and 12 discussed it with your client? 13 MR. AMINI: Yes, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: And Mr. Tamimi, I believe you said you 15 have read the presentence report and discussed it with your 16 lawyer? 17 (Defendant and counsel conferring) 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 19 THE COURT: And Mr. Halperin, you have reviewed the 20 presentence report? 21 MR. HALPERIN: We have, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: I think we covered this but there are no 23 objections to the presentence report; is that right? 24 MR. HALPERIN: No, your Honor. 25 MR. AMINI: My objection was for the level 26 and 23

at the time which the Court denied my motion, so.

THE COURT: Okay.

As I said previously, I adopt the facts set forth in the presentence report as my findings of fact and I'm going to briefly review the guideline calculation which I reviewed at the last hearing we had. The base offense level is 26 under 2M5.1 and for the reasons I explained previously the base offense level 26 applies.

Pursuant to the plea agreement, the defendant is given a three-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility in light of his guilty plea which he has confirmed today. He is not moving to withdraw. The total offense level therefore is 23. His Criminal History Category is I because of no prior offenses and therefore the guideline range is 46 to 57 months.

This is the point where I normally give counsel an opportunity to speak on behalf of the parties. We have discussed quite a bit already, but if Mr. Amini there is anything you would like to add before imposition of sentence, you may. I have reviewed all of the materials that you have submitted.

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, I don't want to take too much of the Court's time anymore. I just want to request leniency in this case because of many circumstances with the family. He is far from his family, nobody can visit him, and he has no medical problem himself. He pulled one of his teeth. He is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

pulling the other one, he has an infection, and I hope the Court will see some of the extra evidence we have for sentencing purposes.

THE COURT: Okay.

Mr. Tamimi, you have already addressed the Court but is there anything else you would like to add today? You are not required to say anything else.

THE DEFENDANT: I just want to express my regret and I sincerely apologize to the Court. And I want to thank my attorney for all the hard work he did and I really, sincerely, apologize to the United States Government.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Halperin, is there anything you would like to say on behalf of the government?

MR. HALPERIN: Very briefly, your Honor.

Since we have submitted a number of submissions already and we have already gone through all the other 3553(a) factors in a previous submission I'm not going to reiterate again but I want to remind the Court because of the nature and circumstance of the offense, Mr. Tamimi's history and characteristics, his role in the offense and the need for deterrence, we had previously argued that those all counsel strongly for a guideline range sentence.

As the Court knows, we were adjourned three weeks because the Court wanted additional materials about really two Number one, which entity was Mr. Tamimi seeking the

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

materials for, was it the military or the Iranian Red Crescent. I think the document made clear by a preponderance of the evidence that it was for the military; and number two, and in a way as significantly, whether or not Mr. Tamimi had lied to the Court. And because we think there is substantial evidence that he lied to the Court both at the pre-sentencing hearing in October and at the plea colloquy in July, the government has taken the unusual step of asking our supervisors for permission to seek the top of the range in this case and, as the Court knows, we are seeking the top of the range. We think 57 months is appropriate for all the reasons we have set previously about the seriousness of the offense but also because the fact that the defendant has lied to this Court is something that we strongly believe should be considered by this Court in determining the appropriate sentence.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Let me ask you, it seems like the contact for which he was making arrangements to obtain the spare parts was with an entity called Panha, P-A-N-H-A, which is kind of the helicopter repair entity in Iran and does things both for the military and not for the military. So, at the end of the day, I don't know that the defendant was specifically -- had the specific intent to aid the military or any other organization. Isn't it possible that he was just a business

person essentially obtaining the spare parts for an entity which I think is in violation of the law and I think certainly reflected a risk that it would go to the military? But is there any evidence that he truly specifically was getting these things for the military as opposed to for Panha?

MR. HALPERIN: I think there is, your Honor. I think the fact that the defendant himself -- and of course the standard here is preponderance of the evidence, obviously not beyond a reasonable doubt -- but the fact that the defendant himself in phone calls with individual 1 on November 19 referenced the jet fighters, that this was for jet fighters, is critical.

THE COURT: But the way -- it is funny. When you read the whole transcript it is almost as though he was referencing the jet fighters in a hypothetical way. It is not clear that those were the spare parts they were talking about in this agreement. Maybe I am misreading it. It is very hard to understand what they were saying but it sounded like it was possibly hypothetical.

MR. HALPERIN: I think the other thing, your Honor, is when in the March 7 call when Mr. Tamimi notes that he told a Mr. Han, frankly, sir, this is military, and they're laughing. Those are other things that I think are important in terms of the Court's consideration.

And Ms. Surratt reminds me, of course, that Tamimi

acknowledged that Panha is connected to Iran's Air Force as well.

So, I certainly agree with the Court that there is a level of connecting the dots but I think based on Mr. Tamimi's own statements in these calls that were recorded it is clear — maybe not beyond a reasonable doubt but certainly by a preponderance of the evidence, that he was trying to acquire these things for the military.

Secondly, what is overwhelmingly clear beyond a shadow of a doubt is that he was not trying to get these for the Red Crescent, in other words that he never mentioned, at all, during the course of the investigation or in its post-arrest statements this was for the Red Crescent and that helps prove the government's point, I would submit, respectfully, as well, that it wasn't until the plea and then at the conference in October that he first mentions the Red Crescent. He doesn't mention it at all. So, I think the lack of discussion about Red Crescent helps prove the government's point as well.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything further?

MR. AMINI: Yes, your Honor.

I attached -- actually Exhibit 3 is in Farsi, I don't know if I can ask the translator to read a couple of things.

It was as I mentioned in the submission, it is a helicopter who belonged to the Red Crescent. It went down on November 2nd of 2011 and actually it says: It is usable but the engine and the

body need to be repaired. Those are in Farsi, I got them from website.

THE COURT: No, I know about the evidence that the Red Crescent uses these helicopters, although I have to say the article that is Exhibit 4 that talks about the helicopter crash, the Red Crescent, did you see the second to last sentence of that article talking about the Red Crescent helicopter actually says the helicopter belonged to the Air Force and was on lease to emergency services. That struck me as undermining the argument that even if it was Red Crescent that that was somehow inconsistent with it fundamentally for the military.

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, Exhibit 4, that is a different crash than Exhibit 3, it is actually 2011, November 2nd. Exhibit 2 actually has a picture of -- it is not crashed to the ground, it actually, they land in the water in the river.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. AMINI: And the body has a problem. And my understanding is, your Honor, the Iranian Red Cross, they own about 19 helicopters but when there is an emergency they even borrow from Turkey. There is one of the actually -- I'm sorry, it comes to Iran and actually crashes and it I have that one in Exhibit 2.

So when there is an emergency they actually borrow from other entities and they have borrowed from Turkey and

1 othe

other surrounding countries to come and help in the big emergencies.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. AMINI: So that is not unusual, your Honor. They have 19 for all purposes but then there is an earthquake or something and the big emergencies then they do borrow.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Is there any reason why sentence may not be imposed at this point?

MR. HALPERIN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Amini?

MR. AMINI: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: In preparing to sentence the defendant I have considered the presentence report, the recommendation of probation, the written and oral statements of defense counsel and the defendant and the government as well as everything submitted on behalf of the defendant. I have considered each of the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. 3553(a) which include the nature and circumstances of the offense, the defendant's history and characteristics, the need for the sentence to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law and to provide just punishment for the offense, also to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct.

I have considered also the sentencing guidelines provisions and policy statements, the need to avoid unwarranted

sentencing disparities.

Starting, finally, the Court is to impose a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with all the sentencing purposes all of which I have considered.

Starting with the nature and circumstances of the offense this is a serious offense. It is a crime that implicates the national security of the United States. It is evident to me that Mr. Tamimi knowingly entered into an agreement to violate the statute IEPA by agreeing for the trans-shipment of helicopter parts into Iran and he did so knowing that such shipment was in violation of the United States law.

The defendant argues a couple of things; one, that the shipment was only for minor spare parts such as bolts and screws; and second that he believed the parts were for helicopters to be used by the Red Crescent organization.

First, the fact that the agreement was only for minor parts does not diminish the seriousness of the offense or his culpability. Parts are parts and minor parts, such as ball bearings are, just as essential as other parts and are equally in violation of the law.

The defendant's recent statements he thought the helicopters would be used for the Red Crescent are not supported by the facts. He did not raise this issue in any of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

his conversations at the time with the co-conspirator or cooperator, nor did he raise it with the government agents after his arrest.

I think it is significant that he actually did refer to the parts as military parts in recorded conversations arranging for the transaction and he indicated that the end user could not leave Iran which suggests that it was probably not the Red Crescent.

In any event, that doesn't change the ultimate culpability or quilt for the crime. I will say, as I mentioned in my questions to Mr. Halperin, it is likely that the parts were intended for Panha, P-A-N-H-A, the helicopter repair company in Iran which services both military and non-military helicopters. It is not clear that he specifically intended that these parts be used by the military. It is possible that he did not care but was involved in the transaction primarily as a business person. That seems likely to me. But that ultimately -- that ultimately did not matter for his culpability. He knowingly committed the crime and at the very least he recklessly disregarded a high risk that the parts could and would be used for a military purpose, and I believe that brings the crime within essentially the heartland of where the guidelines set the range for this offense as properly calculated.

I also need to consider the history and

characteristics of the defendant. I believe the defendant willingly engaged in this conduct that was illegal, although he suggests he was lured into it by the "co-conspirator." There is no basis for concluding that he was not a willing participant or that he would not have considered this conduct absent the other individual's involvement.

Also, I will note that he is apparently a man who has been a good family man. I believe in other ways he is probably a good person, he has provided for his family. He cares about his family very much. His wife and his father have significant health problems but those sorts of family problems are faced by many defendants who commit crimes and they do not reduce the defendant's culpability or the need for an appropriate punishment.

In the end, I believe that Mr. Tamimi was a business person who was willing to take a very serious risk to make money in this situation.

I also need to consider the seriousness of the offense and just punishment and these call for a significant sentence that is consistent with the guidelines. In terms of deterrence, I need to consider the need for both general deterrence and specific deterrence, the need to prevent this defendant from engaging in such activity in the future. I doubt that he will engage in this activity again. If he does, I certainly don't think he will come back to the United States

for fear of getting caught. In terms of general deterrence, though, it is also important for others to know that this is a serious offense that will be taken seriously.

For all of these reasons I intend to sentence the defendant to a guideline sentence of 46 months' incarceration. I'm not going to impose supervised release because under 5D1.1 his deportation is inevitable. I'm not going to impose a fine but there is a \$100 special assessment which is mandatory.

Does defense counsel have any legal objection to the steps or know any legal reason why it may not be imposed?

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, based on the cases of the similar kind, 48 months is not along the line of the other cases.

THE COURT: 46.

MR. AMINI: I'm sorry, 46. We have, again, Dr. Ahtar even with 32 charges against him and pleading guilty for the same IEPA violation he got just probation and he was let go to Iran.

I mentioned Dr. Amir Nazmi -- he was convicted -- convicted of IEPA plus eight other charges in a jury trial; he got only 40 months.

In this case defendant really just gave the list of the items, not even seeing it. I believe 46 months is just too much, is not considering any of these downward departures mentioned in the PSR report, your Honor. I believe that is

just too long for what has been done in this case.

MR. HALPERIN: Judge, that's obviously not a legal reason why the sentence can't be imposed. There is no legal reason why this guideline range sentence cannot be imposed.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Tamimi, please stand.

It is the judgment of this Court that you be committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a period of 46 months. There will be no fine because I find that you are not in a position to pay a fine except for the mandatory \$100 special assessment.

You have a right to appeal your conviction and sentence except to whatever extent you have validly waived that right as part of your plea agreement. If you are unable to pay the costs of appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. Any appeal must be filed within 14 days of the filing of the judgment of conviction.

I direct that a complete copy of the PSR be provided to the Bureau of Prisons and the Sentencing Commission and that counsel on any appeal have access to the report.

The clerk will prepare the judgment and see to it that the required documentation is sent to the sentencing commission.

Does the government move to dismiss the underlying -- I think there was a second count.

MR. HALPERIN: We do, your Honor.

II DBF Stams

THE COURT: That count is dismissed.

And is there a relevant forfeiture in this case or not?

MR. HALPERIN: No forfeiture, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there anything further?

MR. HALPERIN: Nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, can he be sent to Fort Dix in New Jersey, I believe? It is a minimum security prison with the medical facility so he will be at least seen for the heart attack.

THE COURT: Is he getting medical treatment now?

MR. AMINI: Yes, your Honor, but sometimes the medication comes late.

THE COURT: I'm not familiar with what level Fort Dix is. Does the government know anything about that?

MR. HALPERIN: Your Honor, I don't know offhand what level Fort Dix is but I think the Court knows the Court can make a recommendation. BOP will make its own determination as to what level of security prison Mr. Tamimi should be in and obviously almost any, I think BOP facility will have medical facilities to handle what is relatively routine. I'm not minimizing the severity of the illness but this is not an unusual type of illness. So, I think the BOP is well equipped to handle anything like that.

THE COURT: I can make a recommendation. 1 2 MR. AMINI: Yes, your Honor. That's what we ask. 3 THE COURT: Is it because of the northeastern region 4 that he wants or more a specific --5 MR. AMINI: He has no one in the United States. At 6 least he would be close to me so I can probably visit him. 7 THE COURT: Closer to what? MR. AMINI: He would be close my office so I can visit 8 9 him maybe every six months or so, make sure he is doing okay. 10 THE COURT: You are in Washington, aren't you? 11 MR. AMINI: Yes, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: So you suggested Fort Dix. 13 MR. AMINI: He mentioned to me he heard from the other 14 prisoners Fort Dix for his condition is a better place. 15 THE COURT: Okay. I'm happy to recommend that, 16 assuming it is appropriate to the Bureau of Prisons and, again, 17 sometimes it works and sometimes it doesn't. 18 MR. AMINI: Yes, your Honor. Is there anything further? 19 THE COURT: 20 MR. AMINI: No, your Honor. Thank you. 21 MR. HALPERIN: Not from the government. 22 THE COURT: Thank you. 23 MR. HALPERIN: Thank you, your Honor. 24 000